

MAINE MODERATOR'S MANUAL

A GUIDE TO TOWN MEETING

**SIXTH EDITION
2005**



Maine Municipal Association

Community Drive
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 623-8428

**MAINE MODERATOR'S MANUAL
RULES OF PROCEDURE
(Revised 2005)**

TYPE/MOTION	SECOND REQUIRED	DEBATABLE	AMENDABLE	VOTE REQUIRED	RECONSID- ERABLE	RANK/NOTES
PRIVILEGED						
Adjourn (<i>sine die</i>)	Y	N	N	M	N	1
Recess or Adjourn to Time Certain	Y	Y	Y	M	N	2
SUBSIDIARY						
Previous Question	Y	N	N	2/3	N	3
Limit Debate	Y	N	Y	2/3	Y	4
Postpone to Time Certain	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	5
Amend	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	6
INCIDENTAL						
Appeal	Y	Y	N	M	Y	A, B, D
Fix the Method of Voting	Y	N	N	M	N	B
Withdraw a Motion	N	N	N	M	See Notes	B, C, D
MAIN						
Main Motion	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	
Reconsider	Y	See Notes	N	M	N	A, D, E
Take up Out of Order	Y	Y	N	2/3	N	

Y – Yes, this action is required or permitted.

N – No, this action cannot be taken or is unnecessary.

M – Majority vote required

A – This motion may be made when another motion has the floor.

B – Same rank as motion out of which it arises.

C – Only a prevailing negative vote on this motion may be reconsidered.

D – This motion has the same rank, and is debatable to the same extent, as the motion being reconsidered.

E – Only a person who voted on the prevailing *si de* may make this motion.

None of the motions in the table should interrupt a speaker.

This table does not include the statutory procedure for challenge (to question a vote), mentioned in the “Notes for Voters” and discussed in the *Maine Moderator's Manual*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rules of Procedure Table	i
Chapter I. Introduction and Acknowledgements	1
Chapter II. Moderator	1
Election and Tenure	1
Deputy Moderator	2
Qualifications, Duties and Functions	2
Powers and Their Exercise.....	2
Abusive Use of Parliamentary Procedure	2
Disorderliness	3
Parliamentary Order.....	3
The Parliamentary Motion of Appeal	3
The Moderator as Speaker and Voter	3
Swearing Newly Elected Officials	4
Chapter III. A Suggested Outline of Town Meeting	4
Clerk.....	4
Moderator	5
Chapter IV. Unanimous Consent and State Law on Procedure	7
Unanimous Consent	7
State Law on Procedure	7
A Person May Not Speak Before Being Recognized	7
All Persons Shall be Silent at the Moderator’s Command	7
A Non-Voter May Not Speak Without Consent of Two-Thirds Present	7
Challenge (to Moderator’s Declaration of Outcome of a Vote)	7
Chapter V. Recurring Issues.....	8
Separation of Voters from Nonvoters	8
Warrant Articles of No Legal Effect.....	9
Negative Motions	9
The Motion “to Pass Over”.....	9
Amendments and the Concept of an Article’s “Scope”	10
“Capped” and “Open” Appropriation Articles	10
Categorical Budget Article or Line Item Budget Article?	11
The Source(s) of Money to be Voted	11
Written Ballot Voting on Budget.....	12
Amendment Procedure.....	12
Ordinance Enactment and Amendment.....	13
Majority Vote	13
Two-Thirds Vote.....	13
Elections by Majority; by Plurality	13
Chapter VI. Voting Methods	14
Voice Vote	14
Show of Hands	14
Standing Vote	14
Division of the House	14

Written Ballot.....	15
Full, Formal Written Ballot Procedure	15
Less Formal Written Ballot Procedure.....	15
Counting Written Ballots	16
When May Use of Written Ballot be Avoided in Elections?	17
Chapter VII. Motions and Their Rank	17
The Classes of Motions	17
Main Motion, Privileged and Subsidiary Motions	17
Main Motion (including Motion to Reconsider)	17
Amend	18
Postpone to a Time Certain	18
Limit Debate	18
The Previous Question	18
Recess or Adjourn to a Time Certain	19
Adjourn (Sine Die).....	19
The Incidental Motions	19
Appeal	19
Fix the Method of Voting	19
Withdraw a Motion	19
Chapter VIII. Rules of Debate.....	20
Principles.....	20
Rules	20
Moderator Controls	20
Additional Rules	20
Chapter IX. Conclusion and Sources	21
Appendix	22
Notes for Voters on Town Meeting Procedure	

I. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a guide for the orderly conduct of annual and special town meetings in Maine. This is the sixth edition of a manual first published in 1964 and most recently revised in 1989. Its rules are few and simple because a town meeting is no place for complex parliamentary procedure. It is not intended to be a directive – most of the rules discussed here are only procedural suggestions.

Apart from the few rules required by law, any town meeting may adopt reasonable rules of procedure. See *Bullard v. Allen*, 124 Me. 251, 260 (Me. 1925). Because a town meeting is not a continuing body, each meeting is a separate session, so a town that wants to adopt rules of procedure must do so anew, at the start of each meeting. An appropriate motion is “I move that we adopt the *Maine Moderator’s Manual*, 2005 edition, to guide the moderator in the conduct of this meeting.” Note the careful use of the word “guide” here—this motion would neither bind nor limit the moderator (but note, too, that some rules in this Manual are statutory, not merely parliamentary). In lieu of a formal motion, a moderator may simply declare that the moderator will be guided by this Manual, and if no one objects consent can be inferred. A moderator may wish to have at town meeting for reference should need arise a more detailed body of rules such as Demeter or the Massachusetts guide mentioned below.

It is hoped that most town meetings will use this Manual’s rules. If a town meeting does not adopt a system of parliamentary procedure, it is incumbent upon the moderator to institute rules of procedure to keep the meeting orderly. For at least the annual meeting, printing this Manual’s table of rules in the annual report should aid voters in understanding and participating in the town meeting, and may give them a sense of ownership in this unique New England institution. This new edition also includes a page of “Notes for Voters” that can be printed on the reverse of the table of rules.

When no rule in this manual or otherwise known to the moderator seems to cover a situation, remember that there is no substitute for the use of good common sense. Bear in mind, also, when using this Manual’s Rules of Procedure Table, that more thorough compilations, such as *Robert’s Rules of Order*, include variations of the rules for special circumstances (as well as many

other rules for other circumstances). The Table in this Manual is simplified and adapted for Town Meeting use, and may be inconsistent with more thorough, general-purpose treatises. Do not let voters who bring their Robert’s along protract proceedings with a battle of the parliamentary experts or points of parliamentary procedure. Make a procedural ruling with fair dispatch and let it be appealed or not, and continue on as the result indicates. Strive to keep rules few, simple, clear, and protective of the interests of the minority of voters.

We gladly acknowledge the utility of *Town Meeting Time, A Handbook of Parliamentary Law*, by Richard B. Johnson, Benjamin A. Trustman, and Charles Y. Wadsworth (3rd ed., revised 2001 by a committee of the Massachusetts Moderators Association), which has informed much of this revision. We also acknowledge the helpful online materials of Professor John A. Cagle, Parliamentarian for the Academic Senate and Professor of Communications at California State University, Fresno. For access to both, see the sources listed in the final Chapter of this Manual.

Citations to a numbered “Section” (or §) are to laws in Title 30 -A, M.R.S.A., unless otherwise indicated. Additional subjects (such as qualifications of office for moderators and deputy moderators) are discussed in Chapter VII of Maine Municipal Association’s *Town Meeting and Elections Manual*, which may also contain additional discussion of some of the topics covered here.

II. MODERATOR

Election and Tenure

The moderator is the official elected by the town meeting itself to serve as chairperson, to “moderate” the meeting. His or her term of office is for the duration of that town meeting and no longer. If the town meeting is recessed or adjourned to a time certain the moderator has no power in the interim, but presides at the later session without further election or designation by the town meeting. When the town meeting is finally adjourned, the term of the moderator is at a complete end (§ 2524, see Appendix). A later meeting, even one called for the next week, would have to elect a new moderator.

The town clerk, or in the clerk's absence any town selectman or constable, opens the town meeting by calling for the election of the moderator. § 2524. No matter how other town officials are elected, whether by nominations from the floor or by secret (Australian) ballot, the moderator is always elected by "written ballots," slips of paper prepared by the clerk, on which the voters write the name of the candidate for moderator each prefers. More detail is given in the Outline of Town Meeting, below.

Deputy Moderator

A moderator may appoint and swear a deputy moderator to assist in the conduct of the meeting. If the moderator becomes absent from an open town meeting or unable to carry out his or her duties and has not appointed a deputy, the clerk may call for the election of a deputy to act in the moderator's absence. If the clerk is also absent, a selectman or constable may call for the election of a deputy moderator. (For secret, "Australian" ballot elections —those held at a polling place, Section 2528 seems to require that the moderator be present at the polls throughout a secret ballot election, except for a temporary absence, for which the moderator should have a deputy in charge.)

Qualifications, Duties and Functions

Qualifications. Moderators and deputy moderators must be citizens of the United States, residents of Maine, and at least 18 years of age.

Duties. The moderator supervises the election of other town officials and presides over the other business of a meeting, the foremost element of which is the annual appropriations, but which may include ordinance adoption and amendment and other matters as well. Both for elections and for other business, the moderator's general duty is to see that definitive, plain, and clear action is taken on each warrant article. The moderator should ensure that the clerk has ample opportunity to record the actions taken.

Functions. A moderator announces the articles of business to be considered and conducts any elections they call for, recognizes voters who seek to speak, rules out of order clearly frivolous

or obstructive motions, allows debate to proceed following a second and the moderator's statement of a motion to the assembly, enforces rules governing debate and maintenance of order and decorum; answers parliamentary procedure questions and decides all procedural issues (subject to appeal, discussed below), repeats and puts to a vote all questions including motions to amend and announces the outcome of every vote (which is subject to challenge, discussed below), ensures in a reasonable manner the integrity of the voting process including in particular the written ballot process, and allows a motion to adjourn after ascertaining in consultation with the selectmen, clerk, and assembly that no business remains to be conducted and that the clerk who is recording the votes of the meeting has no questions about the wording of any amendments or about any action taken.

A moderator is subject to the same penalties for neglect of official duty as are other town officials. §§ 2524 and 2607.

Powers and Their Exercise

Moderators should be especially on guard to see that a meeting does not become bogged down, sidetracked, or unruly. Section 2524 grants the moderator broad powers of regulation. We also discuss here parliamentary order, the motion to appeal, and the moderator as speaker and voter.

Abusive use of parliamentary procedure. Sometimes a voter may try to use technical parliamentary rules having little application in town meeting. These may confuse the average voter and so may delay the meeting's progress. The moderator should promptly and firmly inform the voter that the particular rule proposed is not being used or is inappropriate and that the motion is therefore out of order, and then state any more appropriate rule. If the voter persists or insists, the moderator may suggest a *Motion to Appeal* (discussed below and in Chapter VII, and also mentioned in the "Notes for Voters") to resolve the matter. If the voter persists after losing a motion to appeal, a moderator may threaten to rule the voter out of order and then proceed to do so if necessary.

The moderator may announce and enforce appropriate rules of debate, e.g., that speakers should address the moderator only, and should

refer to officials by their title and to other speakers only as “the first speaker,” or similar. This is to maintain a formality that will help to keep the focus on business and not on individuals or their differences. For the same reason, all communication from the floor should be through the moderator. Voters should not address an official or other person directly, but should ask the chair to put a question to the third party, because what can start as a mild direct question can become a cross-examination or even a shouting match. The moderator should command silence, if that’s what’s required to rein in speakers who attempt to question others directly, and should insist that speakers address the merits and not personalities or other extraneous matters. Other suggested rules of debate are in the “Notes for Voters” on the inside back cover of this Manual, and there is more discussion in Chapter VIII.

Disorderliness. Occasionally a voter will behave in a truly disorderly manner. A polite caution may obtain cooperation; sometimes a brief recess and interview will end the difficulty. Where only stronger action will suffice, Section 2524 allows the moderator to have a constable escort from the meeting a person who fails to come to order after a moderator’s command to do so, and, if necessary, to hold that person in confinement until the meeting is adjourned. We recommend that this be done only by a constable who holds a course completion certificate from the Maine Criminal Justice Academy (MCJA) allowing the person (with authorization from the board of selectmen) to make arrests. Any deviation from this advice should occur only after specific consultation with town counsel. In towns lacking an Academy-certified constable, the selectmen may wish to talk with the county sheriff before town meeting about the scheduled date and possible need for on-call assistance.

Parliamentary order. The moderator rules on the priority of motions, that is, the various main motions and privileged, subsidiary, and incidental motions. This Manual’s Table includes a column (“Rank”) that should aid in determining the priority of motions where multiple motions are sought or made. Except for an intervening higher-ranking motion or an incidental motion, only one motion should be under discussion and moving towards disposition at any one time. Following this rule closely will prevent confusion. In the event that a second motion of lower rank is offered before the first motion is disposed of, the moderator should indicate that the second

motion is not in order and repeat the essence of the motion that is then being considered by the town meeting. Keeping one subject only before the meeting and keeping the discussion restricted to that single subject will probably take 90% of a moderator’s time and efforts. If many hands are in the air, it will probably be most effective simply to note all of the various kinds of motions down as they are moved and seconded, and then state them to the meeting or otherwise allow debate to begin first on the highest ranking motion, then on the second-highest, etc. If many of the voters who wish to make a motion seek only to amend the pending motion, then it may be most effective to conduct a quick and informal survey of their desires: this may inspire someone to offer a comparatively comprehensive amendment that will address multiple concerns or interests. Remember that no motion is in order for debate until the moderator says it is or otherwise allows debate to commence.

The parliamentary motion of appeal. Where a moderator’s *procedural ruling* (not the moderator’s determination of the outcome of a vote) meets with audible disfavor, maintain order by instructing the meeting on the motion to appeal, under which any voter may appeal to the meeting to overrule the moderator’s ruling. Ask the voter to state his or her objection to the ruling, and, where appropriate, the rule the voter believes should apply. It will suffice, however, if someone says “I move to appeal the moderator’s ruling and I ask that instead we [describing the proposed competing procedure].” Then call for the vote. The question is “Shall the moderator’s ruling be overturned?” A prevailing affirmative vote reverses the moderator and substitutes the rule proposed by the objecting voter. A negative vote sustains the moderator. A tie vote also sustains the moderator, because the question fails to achieve a majority vote. The motion is in this Manual’s Table and mentioned in “Notes to Voters.”

The moderator as speaker and voter. How does a moderator who is also a voter in a town exercise a voter’s right to speak on a motion? Turn the gavel over to a deputy moderator (see below) who has not spoken on the question and does not wish to. To avoid role confusion, go to the floor to seek to be recognized, and resume the chair after the motion has been voted on. It is best to speak, if at all, only when an article distinctly touches and concerns the moderator. For discussion of the non-voter moderator who

wishes to speak on a question, see the discussion in Chapter IV of the 2/3rds consent rule applicable to all non-voters. A moderator who is a voter in the town may vote in any election or on any question, but typically a moderator refrains both from speaking as a voter and from voting, to remain above partisanship. Some treatises applicable in non-town meeting situations allow a moderator to vote to break a tie, or only to break a tie. In a Maine town meeting the moderator should either vote right along with everyone else or refrain from voting. It does not seem sensible, from an outcome point of view, for a moderator to vote in a voice vote or any other vote that is not actually counted: if one more voice or one more hand would determine the outcome then the vote is too close to call in any but quite a small assembly. Except in written ballot voting, the moderator wishing to vote should have a non-voting deputy take over temporarily, even though the moderator's determination of a vote is subject to challenge.

Swearing newly elected officials. By law, the annual town meeting is the meeting at which officials are elected for the ensuing year. However and whenever they are elected, the moderator is empowered to swear them to their offices, and it is fairly common practice for the town meeting moderator in open town meeting to swear, whether individually, by board, or *en masse*, all electees who are present, either after all elections have been concluded or after all the articles on the warrant have been disposed of and immediately before adjournment. To avoid issues of succession in office where an incumbent has not run again or has been turned out of office, it may be best to swear electees in right before adjournment, but most of the time it should be all right just to follow accepted local practice. Including allowing electees to be sworn in later by the town clerk. The wording of oaths of office appears in MMA's *Municipal Clerk's Manual* and *Town Meeting and Elections Manual*.

The moderator should issue a certificate of election to be provided to any electee who is not present. With that certificate the electee can be sworn by any notary public, attorney at law, or dedimus justice. Even without the certificate an electee can be sworn by a town clerk who was present at the town meeting.

The moderator's power to swear one to office is operative only during the open, active session of a town meeting: a moderator's administration of

an oath while a meeting has been adjourned to a later time certain, or during a recess, is invalid and ineffective. Also, the power of the moderator to swear electees is not an exclusive power: one who wants to be sworn in by an attorney or notary friend, for example, may choose to be sworn after adjournment.

In towns that use the Section 2528 secret ("Australian") ballot, the moderator will fill out a certificate of the election results and give it to the clerk but, typically, will not swear electees to office unless the secret ballot voting is followed by a town meeting called by the same warrant. The moderator would likely swear them in either right after convening the open meeting or right before it is adjourned. For secret ballot elections not followed by an open town meeting, the moderator should fill out a certificate of election for each apparent winner and give the certificates to the clerk to deliver. There is probably no need for a moderator to certify open town meeting election results to the clerk in writing, because the clerk is right there and hears the moderator declare the results and makes a record in reliance on that declaration.

When does one's term of office begin? A term of one year or more should be considered to run, in the absence of an express provision of law or ordinance, from town meeting to town meeting. Viewed that way, one's term of office likely begins when the meeting completes its business and adjourns (although, to enter the office, one must both qualify for the office and be sworn). An exception for school committee members allows towns to vote that they take office on a delayed basis, on a designated date before July 1 of the year of election. And a charter town may have a similar delayed entry provision for other elective offices.

III. A SUGGESTED OUTLINE OF TOWN MEETING

Here we outline open town meeting procedure, not secret ballot election procedure. For that, see MMA's *Town Meeting and Elections Manual*.

Clerk. The clerk convenes the meeting at the appointed time, often reading the Greeting and Return from the original warrant.

The clerk calls for election of a moderator by written ballot (this is often the first article in the warrant) and presides over the nomination and

election process. Once the clerk has opened the floor for nominations a person wishing to nominate need not wait to be recognized, and no second is required. A person nominating a person may not speak against that person but may choose to vote against that person. The clerk does not need a motion to close the floor to nominations, but may declare them closed once it is apparent that no additional voters wish to make a nomination. Although not required to do so, the clerk may seek to obtain the oral consent of nominees to serve if elected. The clerk distributes written ballots and then collects and counts them, declares the result, swears the moderator to office, and hands over any gavel or other usual local symbol of office. The clerk moves to a table or desk to record the meeting's actions, and the moderator leads the remainder of the meeting.

Although elections for moderator are often uncontested, written ballot voting should nonetheless be used every time, as the law requires it. If there are multiple nominees and a tie results, all nominees (not just those who are tied if there are others as well who garnered fewer votes) remain in play for the second and any further rounds of balloting. Remember that a tally of 3 - 0 is a majority of votes cast even if there are 1000 voters present: thus, as a time saver where there is only one nominee for moderator, the clerk may wish to distribute ballots only to those few who actually request them, rather than insist that all voters take a ballot and return it whether blank or marked. State law (Section 2525) forbids the election of *any* town official on a motion to cast one ballot. A motion to "have the clerk cast one ballot," and a motion to elect "by acclamation" probably fall within this prohibition. We recommend always obtain at least three ballots, where possible, for any *uncontested* race that can be filled only by secret ballot.

Moderator.

a. The moderator may appoint a deputy moderator and swear in the deputy.

b. The moderator declares that if there is no objection the moderator will be guided by the *Maine Moderator's Manual* in supervising the conduct of the meeting. (The moderator may prefer to solicit a formal motion and vote for this.)

c. The moderator explains such rules as seem warranted at the head of the meeting and covers

housekeeping matters, e.g., maintaining separation of voters and non-voters.

d. The moderator announces the winners of any preceding secret ballot election. The moderator does not swear them in, typically, until just before the meeting adjourns, or swears them in on an agreed understanding that they do not enter into duties of office until after the meeting adjourns. The moderator then conducts elections for other officials remaining to be elected by the town meeting.

e. For elections not previously held, or later to be held, by secret ballot vote, the moderator conducts the nomination process substantially as described above for the clerk in electing the moderator, and calls for the vote, which is done by written ballot for selectman and school committee member even if there is only a single nominee. Remember that even in *uncontested* races a winner must obtain a *majority* of votes in towns of 4000 and under. For offices other than selectman and school committee, where there is only a single nominee, a voice vote or an uncounted show of hands can suffice to elect. Some moderators use the written ballot voting method (by unanimous consent, presumably) whenever there are two or more nominees for a single office or board seat, even for offices for which written ballot voting is not ordinarily required. State law authorizes towns to adopt, in a meeting held at least 90 days before an annual meeting, a requirement that the voting for a particular seat or office in addition to selectman and school committee will be by written ballot (there is no exception for an election with only one nominee); and such a requirement stands until it is rescinded or repealed at a meeting held at least 90 days before the annual meeting. See § 2525. Moderators should ask clerks whether such an extension of written ballot voting to other offices has been locally adopted.

Where there is more than one seat open on a board for the same term of office, it is permissible to have a single set of nominations and a single balloting in a town *over 4000*, in which case each of the top vote-getters is a *plurality* winner to the extent there are offices to fill, but in a town *under 4000* each seat must be filled separately, as each winner must obtain a majority of votes cast. For more discussion of written ballot procedure, see Chapter VI.

f. The moderator declares the winner after each election is complete. The clerk records the votes

or, where voting is by voice or uncounted other means, the outcome.

g. When all elections are complete, the moderator (after any swearing-in ordinarily done at this point) takes up the remaining articles on the warrant. These are usually called the “business articles,” but may in fact include ordinances and resolutions as well as budget articles—i.e., all business other than elections.

1. The moderator reads the first business article after any elections articles in full. Accompanying recommendations or other information are not part of the article and need not be read. By a motion and vote (“to suspend the reading of the warrant articles”) the meeting can waive the routine reading of each article, but the moderator must be aware of possible Americans with Disability Act issues for those with limited vision or other difficulty in reading the warrant in the annual report or otherwise made available to the voters. Even where there are no such special needs, the moderator should be sure to identify each article in turn by number, to ensure that the meeting remains properly focused.
2. The moderator secures an affirmative motion and a second relating to the article. The moderator states the motion to the meeting and thereby opens the motion to floor debate. After this point, a person making the motion (the “movant”) may withdraw it only by leave of the town meeting, given by a majority of those voting. This issue usually involves amendments, not main motions.
3. At this point, if this was not done at the head of the meeting, the moderator may wish to invite the attention of the voters to the Rules of Debate set out in the “Notes to Voters” (where that document has been provided to the voters), and indicate any that the moderator does not wish to apply. The moderator will then want to honor as many as seem appropriate, e.g., to alternate debate between speakers for and against. There is more discussion and there are some suggested rules additional to those in the “Notes to Voters,” in Chapter VIII.
4. The moderator may choose to recognize first sponsors or special interests for background or other information relating to the particular article. Good practice is to

mark the warrant with sponsors’ names, where they are known, before the meeting starts. A special rule relating to non-voters who wish to speak is discussed in the next chapter.

5. When discussion ends, the moderator restates the motion and calls for the vote. If an amendment has been proposed, the amendment is voted on first and then, if there are no other amendments, the main motion (as amended or not, as the case may be) is voted on using a method of voting adopted by the meeting or directed by the moderator.
6. The moderator announces clearly the outcome of the vote so that the meeting knows what happened and the clerk has an opportunity to record the outcome. If the announced outcome of the vote is challenged, the moderator addresses the challenge as discussed below.
7. The moderator ensures the physical comfort of the assembly while it completes the business on the warrant, and without objection or on motion made and seconded adjourns the meeting, either finally (sine die, pronounced “see-nay dee-ay”) or to a date, time, and place certain for the completion of any unfinished business that the meeting wishes to take up at a continuation meeting.

h. Short of a fire in the hall (!), a motion to adjourn is out of order unless the meeting has disposed of all business on the warrant. When adjournment is moved and seconded, a moderator, before putting the question to the assembly, does well to ensure by inquiry of the selectmen, the clerk, and the assembly itself that all warrant articles have been acted upon. Once the moderator puts the question of adjournment to the meeting, it is too late to argue that an item of business is outstanding, because the motion to adjourn is undebatable (and unamendable), so it will have to be defeated (or withdrawn under a *Motion to Withdraw*) in order for the meeting to take up the overlooked article. If the motion occurs while other business is pending, perhaps what the movant intends is a motion to adjourn to a date certain (a continuation meeting, to complete the warrant’s business), so inquire. An adjournment that is not expressly to a date certain will ordinarily be deemed, after the fact, to have been a motion to adjourn “without day” (*sine die*)—i.e., with finality. *Sine die* adjournment cuts off the ability of a voter to use

the *Motion to Reconsider* for any purpose (including to revisit the decision to adjourn), although a new warrant could put the same article before a new meeting.

IV. UNANIMOUS CONSENT AND STATE LAW ON PROCEDURE

Unanimous Consent

A moderator who has the trust and confidence of a town meeting can save the town meeting much time that would otherwise be devoted to unnecessary procedure, simply by asking for unanimous consent to procedure that seems a good idea or unobjectionable. For example, a moderator who knows that an issue is likely to be contentious, *instead of inviting a motion* that the voting on that issue be conducted by written ballot, may say “I ask unanimous consent that the voting on this article be by written ballot” (perhaps stating the purposes such a vote should serve –relative privacy and greater security and certainty of the outcome of the vote). The moderator can instruct that an objecting voter need only call out “No” or “I object.” If no one objects, the moderator will say “There being no objection, voting on this article will be by written ballot.” Less formally, the moderator can just say “Unless someone wants a vote on whether to do it, I propose that the voting on this article will be by written ballot.”

Another example of the use of unanimous consent would be in taking up an article out of order, perhaps because someone who would like to speak *pro* or *con* has a competing engagement to go to, or because the selectmen want to link consideration of an article to another elsewhere in the warrant. This motion requires a two-thirds vote, which can be difficult to discern on a voice vote, or even on an uncounted show of hands or an uncounted standing or rising vote, so it may be worthwhile to try for unanimous consent first. A moderator will likely get an early sense of how receptive the meeting is to using unanimous consent on procedural matters.

Some moderators may wish to minimize the use of unanimous consent, however, because it doesn't take that much time to get a motion and a vote, and it assures voters that they are in charge of the meeting, that the moderator only “moderates” its course.

State Law on Procedure

A very few rules of procedure in Maine are actually set out in law (Section 2524). Because they are law, we recommend that they not be altered, even by unanimous consent in town meeting, but only by charter.(see Section 2501). Two are simple and two require some discussion. All of these are listed in this Manual's “Notes to Voters.”

1. A person may not speak before being recognized by the moderator. The usual practice is that voters raise a hand or stand to signal that they wish to be recognized and given the floor.

2. All persons shall be silent at the moderator's command.

3. A non-voter may not speak without the consent of 2/3rds of the voters present. To avoid having to hold a vote every time a non-voter wants to speak, a moderator may want to elicit, near the head of a meeting and before taking up any article, the identification of non-voters who may want to speak, and to have them named in a single motion (for adoption of which unanimous consent can be sought). Probably the most common example of a non-voter from whom folk may want to hear is a non-resident school superintendent. Others may be identified only later, but this comprehensive motion and vote will cover most non-voters wanting to speak. We recommend against a general motion that *all* non-voters be allowed to speak. Notice, incidentally, that not even a *resident* who is not also a registered voter of the very town holding the meeting may speak without consent. Notice also that the vote must be 2/3rds of all voters in the hall (“present”), not just 2/3rds of those who actually vote, so a moderator may want to try for unanimous consent on this one. Surely it is not necessary to include a non-voter moderator in a motion for consent to speak *as moderator*, because that is precisely what the voters have elected the moderator to do. On the other hand, for the (extremely rare) case in which a non-voter moderator wishes to speak in debate, consent is required.

4. Challenge. Any seven voters may immediately challenge the moderator's determination of a vote. When a vote declared by a moderator is immediately questioned by at least seven voters, the moderator is required

“poll” the voters to make it certain unless the town meeting directs use of a different method. We think “poll” means using the written ballot, not a roll call vote. (*Robert’s Rules* say that a roll call vote is inappropriate for an assembly in which the voters participate directly. So the written ballot, probably because it is the most accurate voting method, is the default method here: the meeting will have to use it unless some other method is agreed upon. But written ballot voting is time-consuming. So moderators may want to make challengers aware of the importance of specifying, where desired, a means of voting less time-consuming than written ballot. In fact, however, the law doesn’t say whether it’s the prerogative of the first challenger to propose the second method of voting, or by what other means it is proposed—it says only that if the town meeting doesn’t specify a different means it will be written ballot. To finesse the statute’s default resort to a written ballot, and to finesse as well the need for a motion and vote on some other method, the moderator may want to use the “unanimous consent” device, e.g., “The result of the voice vote has been challenged by seven voters. Is there unanimous consent that the vote be taken again, by [a named other method]? Hearing no objection, the vote will be by [the specified method].”

It seems fair to guess that outcomes of voice votes or uncounted shows of hands are more likely to be challenged than other means. Although this is a statutory rule of entitlement to re-votes, a moderator may want to convince the meeting, should it come to appear appropriate to do so, that challenges should not be used just to get a routine, instant second vote following a *counted* vote: the moderator may want to ask a challenger why the first counted vote seems uncertain (e.g., a seating section was not counted).

The first statutory rule listed above says that no one can speak without being recognized. The usual procedural rule governing challenges, however, is that if they are not made “immediately” after the vote is declared, the right to challenge is lost. Instruct voters wishing to challenge either to raise their hands (or to stand) to be recognized (see the Rules of Debate in the “Notes for Voters”) or, without waiting to be recognized, to call out “I doubt it” (or “Challenge”) when the result is declared. The outcry will prompt the moderator to learn whether at least six others also doubt the moderator’s determination of the result.

Incidentally, we would probably routinely allow as timely a challenge before a motion relating to the next article taken up has been made and seconded and stated to the meeting by the moderator or otherwise put in order for consideration. A decision to disallow a later motion can be appealed.

A moderator who is in doubt as to the outcome of a vote should not declare a result, but simply say “The vote is too close to call,” and either invite a motion for a specific other method of counting or ask unanimous consent to move to a named other method of voting.

V. RECURRING ISSUES

Here are special situations requiring distinct knowledge or insight. Particular parliamentary procedures apply in some of them.

Separation of Voters from Nonvoters

Typically, the clerk or selectmen will have put into place, when the public is first admitted to the assembly hall, measures to ensure the integrity of voting. These often include the separation of voters from non-voters. Most communities that do this put a barrier through the seating area so that the front part of the area is reserved for voters and the back part for others, but some halls have a balcony or gallery where non-voters must sit. Often, the voting area can be reached only through the center aisle, and the clerk will have arranged for a couple of constables or other designated persons there to keep the nonvoters from entering the area. If a person who is denied entry insists she or he is a voter, the moderator (or registrar of voters) may consult the voting list that is used as the incoming voter checklist to sort voters from nonvoters as they enter the hall, and if the person’s name is on the checklist the person should be allowed to vote. If the person is not on the list and the registrar is present, the registrar may process an application to register.

Some towns use additional or other means to distinguish voters from nonvoters. One, which allows families and friends to sit together, is to issue to voters only, at check-in, a distinctively colored placard or folded flyer (perhaps with this Manual’s table of motions and “Notes for Voters”

printed on it). Show of hands votes can then be of hands holding the placard aloft. Where extra security is desired, a town can combine separate seating of voters from nonvoters with the issuance of a placard. This should considerably facilitate vote counting in large assemblies. Voters could also be instructed to write their names on their placards and to display them when leaving and re-entering the voters' floor area. A moderator will want to ensure that any security measures in effect are respected.

Warrant Articles of No Legal Effect

In some towns, by local custom articles appear on the warrant that are not required by law. Here are three common examples.

1. "To see if the Town will vote to accept the reports of town officials." Where the reports referred to are those in the town's annual report, the article is unnecessary, as town meeting has no power to reject the annual report, so a vote on a motion to approve the article will have no legal effect and is only advisory. For this reason, withdrawal of the motion may be appropriate. The meeting can then by consensus just move on to the next article. The clerk or selectmen may make a note to omit this one in future years.

2. "To act on any other business that may [properly] come before the meeting." By law, the warrant must state in *distinct* articles the business of the meeting, and "[n]o other business may be acted upon." § 2523. The quoted article is an *indistinct* one and therefore ought not be on the warrant. The only business that can be conducted under this article is adjournment (which does not require an article anyway) or uncontroversial courtesy business, like a round of applause for volunteers. Rule substantive motions of new business made under such an article out of order, as a court would on proper complaint declare the action void.

3. Articles that seek to do an illegal thing or that are otherwise beyond the power of town meeting. A favorable vote on an article to operate a municipal market in illegal drugs would be illegal and of no effect. An article to enact a purely local scheme of awarding property tax exemptions in order to attract business to town deals with a matter that the Maine Constitution and state law reserve to the

State. Tax exemptions can legally be awarded, but not by the town meeting, so these articles are *ultra vires* the town meeting —i.e., beyond the power of town meeting to enact. An approved but *ultra vires* article is a legal nullity. These issues probably arise more often from floor amendments than from the warrant. Be alert to them and try to rule them out of order, or state your own views on the legality of the proposal (whether it arises from the article or from a proposed amendment) and ask the clerk to record your views, and then proceed to a vote.

Maine statute law says only that the moderator is "to preside over and supervise the voting at the meeting." Section 2524(3). Arguably, then, a moderator has no power to rein in a meeting that is running off the rails of the law. But consider the alternative, and the argument that a town meeting, like citizens at large, must operate within the bounds of law. Perhaps a well-phrased and well-timed suggestion that the moderator may resign will get the attention of the voters (but of course it risks being applauded!). Another approach may be to work to ensure that the clerk records careful and exact minutes of the doings of the meeting at the point where it goes off the rails. Sometimes a brief recess may aid the situation.

Negative Motions

A negative motion is one on which the voter must vote "No" in order to mean "Yes." Because of the risk of confusion, a moderator ordinarily should rule a negative motion out of order. A common example may be "I move that we not approve Article 12": a person who wishes to approve Article 12 must vote in the negative, and one who opposes it must vote in the affirmative, which stands the usual process on its head. And note that a negative motion does not necessarily include the word "not," e.g., "I move that the Article just read be rejected." Sometimes, advocates of a negative motion will argue that the reason for the wording is to "really send them a message." An appropriate reply is that the best message is an unquestionably *clear* message, and that the way to give that is to act decisively on an affirmative motion that the article be adopted.

The Motion to "Pass over"

The motion to "pass over" may still be in use in some Maine communities. It can be confusing.

The voter must vote “No” on this motion in order to have the matter considered at all by the town meeting. If it is not considered (i.e., if it is “passed over”), it is effectively defeated. Some folks like the motion because it avoids putting the town officially on record as being against something when perhaps they favor the article’s concept generally but just don’t like a particular unamendable element of the proposal (e.g., that funding come from the property tax). Sometimes, too, the motion may be made in order to avoid a “winners and losers” situation on an issue on which quite strong feelings exist, or where the voters prefer a more gentle way to let down petitioners of an article, or a sponsor of an article placed on the warrant by courtesy of the selectmen. And sometimes it will be made where someone thinks the selectmen themselves have brought forward an idea so bad it doesn’t merit debate.

In towns routinely using the motion it is probably well understood. An alternative is simply that no motion be made relating to the article. No motion having been made, neither the article nor its subject matter is before the meeting, and a clerk’s record to that effect is a record that the article was not taken up. In any event, discourage the use of the motion when the intent appears to be to preempt debate on articles that seem perfectly in order for debate.

A good question is whether a motion to pass over should require a unanimous vote; surely at least a 2/3rds vote should be required, as it is akin to a motion to table. This Manual’s Table does not include motions to pass over or to table because it presumes that a town meeting will ordinarily want to take up and dispose of *all* of its business. If a motion to pass over is allowed to go forward, review with the voters before the vote the effect of affirmative and negative votes. And be careful whenever a voter moves that an article be “passed” – ascertain whether the movant means “approved” or “passed over.”

Amendments and the Concept of an Article’s “Scope”

Three common methods of amending. These are (1) to insert consecutive words, (2) to strike out consecutive words, and (3) to strike out words and to insert or substitute different words.

A town meeting warrant is both a warning and a protection. The “Greeting” in a warrant typically says to the constable or other person to

whom it is addressed, “You are required to notify and *warn* the inhabitants” of the meeting. A warrant warns voters of the scope of subjects and actions that may be taken by town meeting, and state law says a warrant must state the business of a meeting in distinct articles, and that no other business may be conducted. § 2523. A voter who reads the warrant and concludes that she or he is comfortable with any outcome under it should be able to go fishing on town meeting day in confidence that the warrant’s statement of town meeting business has reasonable and fair outer limits. The concept of “scope” defines those limits.

If a warrant article asks for \$100,000 from new taxes to build a fire station annex, then the article cannot be amended to change the core subject matter from a fire station annex to an addition to the town library. On the other hand, an amendment could say that the annex will not be built within three miles of the existing station, or that it must be constructed to fireproofing standards of an identified building code. Such amendments relate to putting the core project into execution, but they do not substitute a different vision or purpose for the proposed core project. So think of amendments as being either core or peripheral. For another example, an amendment to erect a sign or plaque, appropriated funds permitting, naming the proposed annex for a firefighter who has died in the line of duty would be peripheral and therefore allowable: it does not interfere with the core proposal, but it does relate directly to the subject matter, so it is relevant (“germane” is the technical word) without overwhelming the core proposal, and therefore would ordinarily be allowable (i.e., the motion to amend is “in order”).

Summary advice. When it is difficult to discern whether an amendment goes too far, think of the hypothetical absent voter and err on the side of caution.

“Capped” and “Open” Appropriation Articles

When a stated sum of money to be appropriated appears *in the actual wording of the article*, the article can be said to be “capped” – the amount cannot be increased. The article can be approved only at the amount stated in the article’s text or at some lower amount stated in the motion on the article or in an amendment to the article where the article is moved as printed.

See *Austin v. Inhabitants of York*, 57 Me. 304 (1869) at pages 306 and 307. The Court said the warrant's notice of such a capped article is "a guaranty against voting a larger sum." This is because of the concept of "scope" and a warrant's warning.

An article that asks "To see what sum, if any, the town will vote to appropriate from surplus [or some other source] for [some stated purpose]" always requires a motion that proposes a precise amount, so a motion to "approve the article as printed" is out of order. Be alert never to let one of these get by, and seek assurance that the clerk is recording the amount moved, and not just that the article was approved or adopted. An appropriate motion in the example above is "I move that the article be approved and that [say] \$10,000 be appropriated from surplus for [the stated purpose]." A motion, e.g., to "approve Article 14 as printed" seems permissible where the article is capped.

Where an article in the "To see what sum" form also has a stated sum, not in the article's text but in an accompanying selectmen's or budget committee's *recommendation* (which usually appears *after* the text of an article, the article is an open one and any amount may be moved and approved.

In towns where recommendations of the selectmen and of the budget committee appear on the warrant, any debate will ordinarily focus on those amounts, and so most budget articles are disposed of with not more than two votes. Where voters have many different notions about the appropriate amount at which to fund an article, a moderator may want to use an informal process to learn all of the amounts voters have in mind and to work through them in an orderly way, from highest down, rather than to rely just on the randomness of which voter is recognized first, second, etc. (When the question is of setting a minimum price at which to authorize the selectmen to sell town-owned property, it is more sensible to begin with the lowest proposed figure.) No law or rule requires an unbending formality in all procedure used at town meeting (but of course the final vote should be a formal one), and the budget process in particular may be an appropriate one for a little play in the joints of government.

Exception to the general rule regarding "capped" articles. Despite a stated amount, an article proposing an amount of damages to be paid to a landowner for a municipal exercise of

eminent domain (an involuntary taking of private land for public purposes) can be moved at a higher amount. The purpose is likely to avoid having the question of damages go to court just because the selectmen have stated too low figure in the warrant.

Categorical Budget Article or Line Item Budget Article?

An article reading "To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$45,000 for road maintenance and repair, as follows:" is arguably *unambiguous* on the question of the selectmen's spending authority where there follows a list of individual roads and amounts for each. Each line item is a firm limit on the amount available for expenditure on the road it names. This article awards line item authority only and not the relative flexibility of a categorical article. An *ambiguous* article would be one reading the same and punctuated the same, but where the word "Recommended" appeared before the list of individual roads proposed for maintenance and repair, and an amendment to clarify whether the article is intended to award categorical authority or line item authority only is in order. The moderator will do well to ensure that the clerk records the amendment clearly. MMA's *Town Meeting and Elections Manual* has more discussion and a reprint of a *Maine Townsman* Legal Note on this subject.

The Source(s) of Money to be Voted

Some towns may use an article form for appropriations that does not name a source. An example could be "To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to expend not more than \$20,000 for a storage shed for cemetery maintenance equipment, and to determine the source or sources of that sum." (Such an article could also ask "To see what sum the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to expend for a storage shed for cemetery maintenance, and to determine the source or sources of that sum.") Do not overlook the need to obtain a main motion or amendment that specifies a source, e.g., property taxation, motor vehicle excise taxes, or town surplus. The selectmen likely will have sources in mind.

The concept of *scope* (discussed above) means that where an article *does* state a source of funding, the source ought not be changed to another one by amendment. For example, if an article proposes to raise a tax, the meeting

ought not substitute taking the money from surplus or selling a town asset to raise cash.

Similarly, if a \$20,000 article proposes \$10,000 from motor vehicle excise taxes and \$10,000 from surplus, the town meeting can delete or reduce either amount, but it may not offset the decrease in one by increasing the other, even though it is not increasing the total amount requested. This, too, follows from the concept of scope: a voter who has read the warrant should be able to be absent from the meeting in reliance that, under the article, not more than \$10,000 will be taken from excise taxes or from surplus to fund it, and that, although one of these two sources can be eliminated, no other source can be substituted or added.

Written Ballot Voting On Budget

Beginning in 2005, a town meeting vote to override the “property tax levy limit” must be by written ballot. See 30 -A MRSA § 5721-A(7). The clerk should record the count.

Also new in 2005, a town meeting vote of an “additional local appropriation” for education that exceeds the “local cost share expectation” must be by written ballot if the additional local appropriation would cause the school administrative unit to exceed the “maximum school spending target.” See 20 -A MRSA § 15671-A(3) and (5).

The clerk should now record in the minutes the tallies of votes on: (1) municipal contribution to the school administrative unit’s contribution to the total cost of funding public education from kindergarten to grade 12; (2) the annual debt service payments on non -state-funded school construction, (3) the amount of additional local funds for education; and (4) the total school budget amount. See 20-A MRSA § 15690.

Amendment Procedure

The purpose of the *Motion to Amend* is to modify or change a seconded, pending motion before voting to adopt or reject the pending motion. The first amendment to any pending main motion (typically, an article as printed) is called “the primary amendment.” A primary amendment to the main motion must be “germane” (i.e., it must be related) to the main motion. It cannot introduce a new and separate subject, although it can introduce an aspect or facet of the subject of the main motion that is not addressed by the

main motion. A person wishing to make an amendment to the main motion seeks to be recognized by the moderator, and, once recognized, makes an amendment motion. A voter seconding the amendment motion need not wait to be recognized, and a second is usually forthcoming. If none is, the moderator may ask “Is there a second?” and if so may say “It has been moved and seconded that [stating the motion]” and then ask “Is there discussion?” and then the floor is open for discussion and debate. If the motion to amend is not seconded, the chair may say, “Hearing no second, the motion to amend is not before the meeting. Is there discussion of the main motion or is there another motion to amend the main motion?” and the meeting proceeds accordingly.

Only one primary amendment can be pending at any one time: it must be disposed of, with or without amendments to itself, before another primary amendment is in order. The first amending motion is itself debatable where it is applied to a debatable motion, is itself amendable, requires a majority vote, and may be reconsidered.

When debate on the amendment seems complete, the moderator asks, “Are you ready for the question?” and if it then seems appropriate to vote, repeats the question by saying “It has been moved and seconded that the main motion be amended by [stating the amendment]” and takes the vote. If the amendment is approved, the moderator then states the main motion as amended and calls for debate, and, similarly, following debate, asks the voters if they are ready for the question and then repeats it, takes the vote, and declares the result. If the amendment to the main motion is defeated, the moderator says, “The ‘No’s’ have it and the motion to amend fails. Is there another motion to amend?” If none is forthcoming, then the moderator asks, “Is there further discussion of the main motion?” and, if none, confirms this by asking “Are you ready for the question?” If no one seeks to speak, the moderator may say, “It has been moved and seconded that [e.g., Article 14 be approved as printed in the warrant]. Those who favor the motion will now say ‘Aye,’” and then “Those opposed to the motion will now say ‘No.’” The moderator then declares the result.

Some moderators may choose not to allow secondary amendments. Where allowed, a secondary amendment —an amendment to a primary amendment— must relate to the primary amendment. It is disposed of before the primary

amendment. If it is defeated, then another secondary motion may be introduced. If it is approved, then the primary amendment, as now amended by the amendment to it, is next disposed of. When the primary amendment has been disposed of, other primary amendments may be in order. Ultimately, the main motion is taken up (as amended or not) and disposed of.

Amendments in the third degree not allowed.

An “amendment to the amendment to the amendment” should never be allowed —it is too complicated for town meeting.

Ordinance Enactment and Amendment

The wording required by Section 3002 for enactment of ordinances and ordinance amendments calls for a “Yes” or “No” vote on a new ordinance or amendment to an existing ordinance as advertised by the warrant. Because ordinances by their nature are substantive law, no amendment to an ordinance or to a proposed amendment to an ordinance should be accepted from the floor. If there is a perceived serious defect in the proposed ordinance or the proposed amendment, the selectmen should either ask the meeting to enact it without change and then plan to bring repairs back to a future town meeting or (more appropriate where the defect is central or large) move to take up the next article out of order and proceed to the conclusion of the meeting without returning to the ordinance or amendment article. If an article moving the ordinance or amendment is already on the floor, its proponent can make a *Motion for Leave to Withdraw* it. An appropriate clerk’s record might read, “On motion of Selectman Johnson seconded and voted, the meeting gave leave to her to withdraw her motion to approve Article 46. It was duly withdrawn and the meeting took no further action on that article.” Leave could also be given by unanimous consent, in which case the clerk would record that fact.

Because comprehensive land use plans and zoning maps are also substantive, do not allow floor amendments to them, either.

Majority Vote

No general Maine statute requires town meetings to act, either on an election or an issue, by a majority of voters present. The general parliamentary rule is that a majority is 50% plus one of those voting, but that if an odd

number of votes is cast, a majority is one more than the number of votes cast on the opposing side. Thus, 41 is a majority of both 80 votes and of 81 votes, and this is so even if 80 other voters present refrained from voting. The fact that 80 of those present did not vote means nothing unless a particular statute (or a Private and Special Act of the Legislature) requires that there be an absolute majority vote of all persons present: where such a vote is required but not attained, the motion fails.

The exception to the general parliamentary rule requiring elections and issues to be determined only by those actually voting is the particular Maine statute, discussed above, requiring the consent of at least 2/3rds of voters present before a non-voter may speak.

Two-Thirds Vote

The long way to determine whether a vote of at least two-thirds vote has been attained is to add the affirmative and negative votes and multiply the sum by .66666, or to multiply the vote total by 2 and then divide that product by 3. Thus, if 60 votes are cast in all, two times that is 120, and 120 divided by 3 = 40, so if the affirmative votes total 40 or more, then a two-thirds vote has been attained. This is harder to calculate, however, where the total vote is (say) 62, because of rounding. The easier and faster way to determine whether a vote is by 2/3rds or better is to double the negative vote: if the affirmative vote is that large or larger, then the vote is 2/3rds or better. If the negative vote is 20 (say) out of 62, then an affirmative vote of 40 or more prevails and any lesser vote fails. If the negative vote were 21 out of 62, then an affirmative vote of 42 or more would prevail, but there cannot be more than 41 affirmative votes out of 62 total if there are 21 negative votes, so the measure fails for lack of 2/3rds. Certainly on a motion requiring a 2/3rds vote, the clerk should always record the actual vote tally, to show whether the 2/3rds was attained, e.g., “On motion made and seconded, it was voted 43 to 19 to limit debate to three minutes per speaker. The Moderator declared that the motion had carried.”

Elections by Majority; by Plurality

Elective offices in towns (and plantations) of 4,000 or fewer in population must be filled by majority vote at town meeting. § 2526. Voting should continue until a majority is achieved or it

becomes clear a deadlock is not going to be broken. A nominee who has more votes than any other nominee but who has less than a majority is a person who has a mere plurality of the votes cast. If a mere plurality candidate is declared the winner in a town of 4,000 or fewer, there will have been a failure to elect, which produces a vacancy in office, and that will require another election if the office is selectman and for most other offices (school board members are subject to unique rules, not discussed here) will result in the office's being filled by appointment by the selectmen rather than by vote of the town meeting. See Section 2602. In towns larger than 4,000, election of town officials is by a mere plurality, so the first vote determines the matter unless it is a tie. § 2526. Obviously, votes on issues always require a majority vote in all towns.

All elections using the statutory secret ballot (voting at a polling place) are determined by plurality vote regardless of the town's population. § 2528.

VI. VOTING METHODS

Five methods of voting —voice vote, show of hands, standing vote, division of the house, and written ballot —are available at town meeting. Here we discuss them in their probable descending order of frequency of use, and in ascending order of certainty of result or security of the vote.

For voting on issues, voice voting or show of hands will probably be regarded as the presumptive first method of voting. Any voter by motion can propose a different method of voting. Where no motion is forthcoming but a moderator thinks that a vote by some other method may be appropriate for a particular article, the moderator can suggest or invite an appropriate motion. Or, a moderator can just seek unanimous consent to a different method or simply announce that voting will be by some other method and see if anyone objects, and then, infer unanimous consent from silence. As discussed above ("Unanimous Consent"), some moderators will prefer to have a Motion to Fix the Method of Voting.

1. Voice Vote ("As many as are in favor of the motion will now please say 'Aye'.... As many as are opposed will now please say 'No.'")

When a moderator thinks a voice vote is too close to call, the moderator may, without waiting for a challenge (discussed in Chapter IV), ask for a show of hands vote or may prefer to go to a standing vote.

2. Show of Hands ("As many as are in favor of the motion will now raise their right hand...[observing or counting]. Hands down. As many as are opposed to the motion will now please raise their right hand... [observing or counting]. Hands down.")

When a voice vote is questioned and the outcome is not sufficiently clear, so that a vote of greater certainty is demanded, the moderator may say it is too close to call and then ask for a show of hands on the affirmative and then on the negative. This will save more time than other methods. Of course hands can always be counted, but it will probably be more accurate to proceed to a standing vote, discussed next. In any event, remember that no matter which of the first two methods is generally used, one can always move before -hand for a more certain method, and one can challenge a result immediately after it is declared and (with six other voters) ask for use of a more certain method of voting.

3. Standing Vote ("As many as are in favor of the motion will now please rise....Be seated. As many as are opposed to the motion will now please rise....Be seated.")

If an uncounted show of hands is indecisive, the moderator may then call for a standing vote (also called a "rising" vote). If the outcome cannot be called without a count, then the proponents stand and are counted by the moderator or (in larger assemblies) by tellers that he or she would appoint, and then the opponents stand and are likewise counted.

4. Division of the House ("As many as are in favor of the motion will please assemble to the right side of the moderator's podium and as many as are opposed to the motion will now please assemble to the left side of the moderator's podium.") Where a count is then to be made by tellers: "You will pass between tellers of the election as they may direct you and return to your seats after you have been counted [or, when I so instruct you]." Or other appropriate direction may be given.

Of the first four types of votes, this one is the most decisive and is probably quicker than a written ballot vote. It is important for the moderator to establish controls for the ends of the two lines, to frustrate attempts at voting twice. The tellers report their counts to the moderator who announces the outcome and then the voters return to their seats if they have not been asked to do so promptly after voting. If secrecy is an issue (it will be when feelings are running high), then all other forms of voting should probably be ignored and a written ballot should be taken from the first. Some moderators would caution that a physical division of the house can itself emotionally divide the house: where there is any *potential* for feelings to run high, it may be better to bypass this method and use written ballots.

5. Written Ballot (whether used by vote, by unanimous consent, or because required by law for selectman and school committee) "Voting will be conducted by written ballot. Each voter will receive and return one ballot only, whether marked or unmarked, and will if voting write the name of the person of the voter's choice on the ballot" [or, "will check the appropriate box, yea or nay, on the question".] Where plain pieces of paper are used even for voting on questions (discussed below), the moderator instructs voters to write "Yes" or "No" on the ballot.

The town clerk must prepare a sufficient number of these written ballots before town meeting. The ballots must be of uniform size and color and must be blank, except that 2 squares may be printed on them with "Yes" by one and "No" by the other. § 2524. The moderator or tellers appointed by the moderator pass out the written ballots, one to a voter for each vote taken. No other ballots may be counted.

The process requires more time than others, and so should be resorted to too fast or frequently where its use is not required by law (election of moderator, selectmen, and school committee), by express vote of the town meeting, or pursuant to a challenge to the moderator's determination of a vote.

Some moderators may wish to discourage folding of ballots (unfolded ballots can be counted more quickly), but in fact no state law forbids folding them, and voters may feel they lose privacy unless the local procedure allows voters to deposit their ballots directly into a ballot box. In any event the moderator should instruct

that ballots should not be folded one inside another, or they will risk being invalidated.

Full, formal written ballot procedure. In its most secure form, voters come forward, much as at the polls for a secret ballot election, and may even be checked off on a voting list to ensure they do not vote twice, and each personally deposits a written ballot in a ballot box under the watchful eye of the moderator, deputy moderator, or a teller. In some towns, this full-blown procedure is used, perhaps, because written ballot voting is being confused with the Australian secret ballot method. Because this is a slow process in large assemblies, it may be best to use it only where it has been routinely used locally or where the town meeting indicates that for a particular vote it wants all attendant formalities observed. The moderator can appoint a chief teller, who will supervise the counting and present an oral or written report of the balloting to the moderator, who then declares the result. For more discussion, see "Counting written ballots," below.

Less formal written ballot procedure. No Maine law expressly requires the full procedure described above. Where a moderator or a town meeting is willing to trade off some security to save some time, the following modifications may seem desirable, and moderators and meetings can come up with their own procedures and perhaps implement them without objection. First, where voters are segregated from nonvoters, or where a colored placard is given to voters on check-in for identification, the moderator or tellers can distribute ballots to voters in their seats, working down the aisles in a larger assembly and counting the number required for a row and allowing them to be passed down the row, one per voter. The moderator would want to be sure to instruct that every voter should take one and return one, even if returned blank. Because of the segregated seating and/or use of a placard system, the use of a check-off voting list for every written ballot can be dispensed with without seriously compromising the integrity of the voting. The tellers can allow a minute or two for marking ballots and then in smaller assemblies collect a ballot back from each voter or where seating is in rows with aisles instruct voters to pass their ballots to the voter on the aisle, who will hand all of them to a collecting teller. As all ballots in tellers' sections are collected they bring them forward to a counting table and stand by for counting.

In this suggested alternative system, a ballot box is not used at all: ballots can be collected in hand, or in hats or shoeboxes for that matter. Distribution and collection can be accomplished fairly quickly, and the process does not compromise much in privacy or security.

Counting written ballots. At an appropriate point, the moderator may say, "The voting is now concluded," and the count will then begin. The tallying should be done in sight of the assembly rather than in a separate room. The tellers refer any ballots they feel ought not be counted to the moderator for resolution. The moderator may seek the tellers and the clerk's counsel on questionable ballots. A ballot should be counted if it is possible to infer that the voter has made a choice, and to discern that choice. For example, if a written name has a line through it, the appropriate inference would be that the voter made a choice and then negated it and did not make another choice, and is effectively casting a blank ballot.

For tallying written ballots, here is some guidance for the counters. On a pre-printed "Yes" and "No" ballot, any method that clearly indicates the voter's intent as to choice suffices—e.g., marking the box with a check mark (v) or cross ("X"), filling in a box, circling a box, circling the word "Yes" or "No," or underlining a word. In voting for an office, a misspelled name or use of a surname or first name only where only one nominee fits the bill should not invalidate a ballot.

Blank ballots are those on which no name has been written or on which no box or choice has been marked or otherwise indicated. Blank ballots should be totaled separately from other ballots and are omitted from any statement of the total vote. However, invalid—i.e., non-countable—ballots should be included as a listed element in a tally of total votes cast, where a total is compiled and reported. Invalid ballots are: two or more ballots that are folded together, where it is more likely than not that they did not simply become accidentally commingled in the ballot box or in the process of collection, or in the counting pile. For example, if two ballots are folded twice together—i.e., by thirds, this would tend to show that one person controlled both, which is why neither should be counted, because to count one would not punish the conduct and to count two would reward it. Also invalid are ballots with an "overvote," e.g., where two board members are to be chosen by writing two names on a single written ballot from among

five nominees for equal terms of office, and a ballot has three or more names written on it and no other markings on the ballot indicate a narrowing of choice to two. Also invalid for counting purposes are ballots from which no clear choice can be determined or inferred, as well as ballots that are simply unintelligible (e.g., a plain-paper ballot for a "Yes" or "No" vote on which instead of writing one of those two words the voter has written something else that can in no way be construed as an affirmative or negative vote). If the number of unintelligible ballots will affect the outcome, the moderator should expressly rule on them and then allow those determinations to be appealed to the meeting, or simply put the question of acceptance of them directly to the meeting.

The clerk's duty is to record "the votes" of the meeting, which likely includes the numbers and not just the outcome. Although no law requires a formal written report from the tellers to the moderator, it is sound practice for the chief teller, witnessed by at least one teller, to write down the results and pass them to the moderator. For every race for an office (even an uncontested one), the chief teller should write down the tally for each nominee, the total of blank ballots, and the total of invalid ballots, and it may state (and should state, in towns of population 4,000 and under on votes for officials) also the total votes cast, including invalid ballots but excluding blanks from that total.

The total number of votes cast is needed in order to say whether a majority vote for a candidate has been attained in a town of 4,000 or under, something that will not always be apparent in a race with three or more candidates. Consider a tally of 49, 36, 11, and 3, with 4 illegal ballots: it would be easier to determine whether the highest vote-getter has a majority if the actual total of 103 were stated; with that, it is apparent that no candidate has a majority on this ballot. Where this happens, the moderator declares "No election," or explains "There has been a failure to elect, because no candidate has attained a majority of votes cast," and the voting will continue until a majority is attained or until the moderator without objection declares a deadlock or the meeting agrees to end voting or simply adjourns without filling the position. A fair question is whether the moderator should announce *by the numbers* an interim result like this, before each successive round of voting. It seems fair to do so.

When may use of the written ballot be avoided in elections? For offices other than selectman and school committee (and moderator) in a town that has not by vote designated any other office to be elected routinely by written ballot, where there is only one nominee, any other method of voting can be used unless the meeting votes otherwise. Usually, a voice vote will be taken where there is only one nominee. The moderator should be sure always to call for the Nays as well as the Yeas—this is not a mere formality. In theory, it may be possible to vote by means other than written ballot where there are two nominees for offices not required by state law to be elected by written ballot, but it will be best if any other method is approved by unanimous consent. Commonly, written ballot will be resorted to even where there are only two nominees. Where there are three or more nominees, always use written ballots.

In any event, in towns of population 4,000 and under, the moderator should always verify that an apparent winner in a race of three or more nominees has indeed won a majority of all votes cast. In a race between two, short of a tie, one nominee will always win a majority of the votes cast, absent a large number of invalid votes.

VII. MOTIONS AND THEIR RANK

The rank of motions governs which motions may be made when another question is pending. For example, while a motion to adjourn is pending, no other motion can be made. The main motion has the lowest rank—it cannot be made or acted upon when another motion has the floor, and it yields to all other motions that can be made while another is pending.

The Classes of Motions

Motions are commonly classified as privileged, subsidiary, incidental, and main. All privileged motions rank higher than any subsidiary motion, and incidental motions take the rank of the motion out of which they arise. In this Manual, the motions, in order from highest rank to lowest, are: (1) (privileged motions) Adjourn (*sine die*—without day), Adjourn or Recess to a Time Certain; (2) and (subsidiary motions) The Previous Question, Limit or Extend Debate, Postpone to a Time Certain, and Amend. The Incidental motions are: Appeal, Fix the Method of Voting, Nominations (when made to a committee that the town meeting decides to

establish on the spot), and Withdraw a Motion. Subsidiary and incidental motions must relate to the motion out of which they arise. The Main Motion has no rank. A Motion to Reconsider is itself a species of Main Motion, as is a motion To Take up an Article Out of Order.

A Motion to Reconsider takes the same rank and is debatable to the same extent as the motion out of which it arises. Thus, for example, because a Motion to Limit Debate is not itself debatable, a Motion to Reconsider action taken on a Motion to Limit Debate is itself not debatable. For more, see the Table on the inside front cover of this Manual.

Main Motion, Privileged and Subsidiary Motions

Here is some discussion of the main motion, which has no rank, and of selected privileged and subsidiary ranked motions in ascending order of precedence.

1. Main Motion (including Motion to Reconsider)

This has no rank or precedence and may not be made when any other question is before the meeting.

The *Motion to Reconsider* should be regarded as a *Main Motion*. Ordinarily, it can be made at any time until a *Motion to Adjourn* is approved. It may be preferable to seek unanimous consent to a rule that a main motion may be reconsidered not later than after the next warrant article is disposed of. While that rule itself could be altered by the town meeting, it is possible that once the meeting establishes it or accepts it, it will be accorded deference in all but the most unusual circumstances. This will avoid midnight attacks on articles decided hours before. Adoption of this suggestion would not preclude reconsideration of procedural motions, such as to *Limit Debate*.

If such a rule were adopted, it would seem fair to allow, at a continuation meeting, a motion to reconsider the last article disposed of at the initial session. If the rule were not adopted, it would seem that any article approved at the initial session could be reconsidered at any time before all continuation sessions are finally adjourned, just as all actions can be reconsidered until the final adjournment of a

meeting that is concluded without a continuation session.

A *Motion to Reconsider* may be postponed to a time certain. It is debatable to the same extent that the motion proposed to be reconsidered was itself debatable. It may not be amended, nor itself reconsidered. Votes on *the Previous Question* and on motions to recess or adjourn may not be reconsidered. In the Table, we recommend that the motions *To Fix the Method of Voting* and to *Take Up Out of Order* be also regarded as not reconsiderable. And, if we regard a nomination as a motion (that one be elected), then nominations ought not be reconsiderable, either.

Reconsideration triggers a two-step process. The motion—the question whether to reconsider—must first be voted on. If it carries, the meeting then revisits the item of business. Whether the meeting simply votes anew on the same motion, whether new discussion will be allowed, and whether, and under what circumstances, the originally-voted-on motion may be modified, are questions that may require resolution. Probably the best advice, particularly in the context of reconsideration of *defeated* appropriation articles, is that whatever reasonable process the moderator or the town meeting adopts is probably going to withstand any later attack, so just work it out on the spot.

2. Amend

This is a subsidiary motion and must be disposed of before the main motion is voted on. See the Table for the rules governing it. The motion is discussed in several contexts in Chapter V.

3. Postpone to a Time Certain (“I move that this article be postponed until after consideration of Article No. _____” (referring to one farther on in the warrant) or “until _____ o’clock.”)

This motion defers the article under consideration, not the town meeting itself. If the motion carries, the meeting proceeds to the next article. The motion takes precedence over either the *Main Motion* or a *Motion to Amend* and has the effect of delaying action while the meeting proceeds with other business. Akin to the *Motion to Take Up an Article Out of Order*, this motion also operates to re-order slightly the sequence of articles (but not their numbers) in the printed warrant.

It is best not to name a significantly later time in the motion, but to refer to another article by number, to avoid a situation where the meeting completes all of its business long before the stated hour for taking up a particular article. In that situation a *Motion to Reconsider* the Motion to Postpone is probably what’s needed.

The *Motion to Postpone to a Time Certain* requires a second and is amendable and debatable, and requires a majority vote. In debate, the merits of the underlying question are pertinent only as they relate to the question of postponement.

4. Limit Debate (“I move that debate on the pending article [or “motion”] be limited to [____ minutes per speaker] [to a total of ____ minutes]”).

This motion requires a second and is undebatable but may be amended. It requires a two-thirds vote and may be reconsidered. When it is made, a moderator should get straight with the movant whether it is intended to apply only to the pending motion (e.g., a motion to amend) or to all associated motions (i.e., including the underlying main motion).

In general parliamentary procedure the Motion to Limit Debate can be used to extend as well as to limit debate. Because of the size of most town meeting agendas, it is suggested that it not ordinarily be made available to extend debate. If it is allowed in order to extend debate, be aware that sometimes it may be offered in that form solely to wear out the assembly’s patience and attention before it reaches some other article deeper on the warrant.

The need for this motion in order to impose a time limit on individual speakers can usually be avoided by a moderator’s judicious use of unanimous consent. Perhaps consent can also be obtained for limiting the total time for debate on an issue, but here a little prompting or polite inquiry will often move debate along. If a moderator simply orders a limit on debate, the order should be subject to a Motion to Appeal.

5. Previous Question (“I move the previous question”)

This is a subsidiary motion that has the effect of ending debate and moving directly to a vote on the underlying question, which is usually the pending article or an amendment to it. When this motion is made it must be voted upon immediately, and it is not subject to debate.

Because it has the effect of ending debate, it requires a 2/3rds majority. If it carries, then the meeting proceeds to vote on the pending question (e.g., "The question is, Shall Article 19 be approved as printed?").

6. Recess or Adjourn to a Time Certain ("I move that this meeting be in recess until/for [state a time/a number of minutes]," or "I move that this meeting adjourn until seven o'clock tomorrow evening.")

This is a privileged motion that is always in order, even when another subject is before the meeting. For simplicity, our Table of Procedure makes it debatable. Some moderators would perhaps make a finer ruling and say that it must be acted upon immediately, without debate, if it interrupts an item of business, but that if it is to grant time for meals or for counting ballots or for some other purpose, it is just like any other main motion and is debatable.

And see the discussion of the *Motion to Adjourn*, next below.

7. Adjourn (*Sine Die*) ("I move that this meeting be adjourned," or "I move that this meeting be adjourned *sine die* ") (pronounced "see-nay dee-ay")

This motion, if adopted, dissolves the meeting. It should be handled circumspectly. Good practice is to regard the Motion to Adjourn as not debatable (and not amendable, nor reconsiderable) if it is clear that all of the business of the warrant has been disposed of, but to treat it as being debatable where that is not the case. Before putting the question, the moderator should ensure that the voters understand the effect of approval of this motion.

The Incidental Motions

1. Appeal ("I appeal the moderator's ruling, and I ask instead that [stating an alternative procedure or ruling].")

When a *Motion to Appeal* is seconded, the moderator may wish to reconsider the ruling just made, and correct or alter it as may then seem appropriate, and then see whether the movant will withdraw the appeal. If not, then the moderator puts it to the floor for action in the form of the question "Shall the moderator's ruling be overturned and the proposed substitute rule be approved?" On a tie vote, the negative

prevails and the moderator's ruling is upheld. A moderator may debate the appeal without leaving the rostrum or lectern, because the issue arises from the moderator's official position. A moderator who wants to speak as a voter should appoint a deputy and go to the floor, as discussed in Chapter II. A moderator who is a voter is not obliged to refrain from voting on the question. An appeal is not amendable but is ordinarily debatable. An appeal, being an incidental motion, yields to privileged motions, and *The Previous Question* is available to expedite voting on it.

A fair question is what to do when an appeal proposes a potentially illegal course of conduct, one that demonstrably prejudices the rights of the minority of voters, such as allowing a majority vote where a two-thirds vote is required, or that clearly prejudices the rights of absent voters, such as allowing an amendment that is clearly beyond an article's scope. Chapter V's discussion of what to do when a voter proposes an illegal main motion or amendment is pertinent also to procedural motion appeals.

2. Fix the Method of Voting ("I move that we vote on the pending motion by [specifying a method of voting].")

This motion requires a second but is not debatable or amendable, and may not be reconsidered. The usual rule of parliamentary procedure may allow debate and amendment, and a moderator certainly can ask unanimous consent to allow debate where some good reason appears. But ordinarily the reasons favoring a more secure or a more private method of voting in a town meeting will be fairly apparent from the subject matter or other circumstances.

Even before the first vote is taken this motion allows a voter to propose a method of voting other than voice vote, which is presumably the customary method of voting. The challenge procedure discussed in Chapter IV, by contrast, is used *after* an initial vote in order to determine the outcome by a more certain means.

3. Withdraw a Motion ("I move that I be allowed to withdraw my motion.")

Why do we need a Motion for Leave to Withdraw? The parliamentary concept is that once a motion is on the floor, it belongs to the assembly and may be withdrawn only with the permission of the assembly. But sometimes a

movant realizes that his motion is causing embarrassment to himself or another, or that its importance is not proportional to the time likely required for debate. So, a voter making a motion can unilaterally withdraw it even after it has been seconded, but not once the moderator has put the motion to the town meeting for debate ("It has been moved and seconded that....Is there discussion or an amendment?") or allows debate to proceed without formally repeating the motion. Thereafter, if unanimous consent is not sought or is sought but not obtained, the Motion for Leave to Withdraw should be used, where a movant has a change of mind, and the question is determined by a majority of those voting. See the Table for the Motion's attributes. This motion yields to privileged motions, and may be made while incidental and subsidiary motions are pending (and carries them with it), and no subsidiary motion can be applied to it.

It follows that a motion may not be withdrawn (even with leave) after it has been voted on. The Motion to Reconsider is in order then. A motion to withdraw made while voting on the underlying motion is in progress is allowable but must pass unanimously.

The motion is also available to modify a motion in lieu of withdrawing it, although in that instance the voter who has seconded it can withdraw her or his second. In the informal play of town meeting, sometimes a speaker will ask whether the movant will accept a certain modification to her or his motion (often called a "friendly amendment"), and sometimes the movant will indicate acceptance; and so, without a formal motion to amend or to modify, but by general consent, a motion winds up being effectively modified or amended; and general consent will be taken to be unanimous consent in the absence of any objection. Where a movant does not accept a suggestion for modification another voter can make the suggestion the subject of a *Motion to Amend*.

VIII. RULES OF DEBATE

Principles. Dr. John A. Cagle (see the Preface to this Manual) suggests the following as bedrock principles: (1) the purpose of parliamentary procedure is to facilitate, not to obscure or confound, the transaction of business, and to promote cooperation and harmony (and, we might add, courtesy and justice, or fairness); (2) all voters in attendance

have equal rights, privileges, and obligations, and, while the majority has the right to decide most questions, the minority has rights to be protected (foremost, the right to be heard); (3) full and free discussion of every motion is a

fundamental right, (4) only one question may be considered at any given time, unless by agreement; and (5) voters have the right to know at all times what the immediately pending question is, and to have the moderator restate it before a vote is taken. A good moderator is in truth, and is perceived to be, fair and impartial throughout the proceedings.

Rules. This Manual's "Notes to Voters" lists almost twenty rules of debate, all of which a prospective moderator should review, and any of which the moderator or the meeting may modify. Among those listed in the Notes are the statutory rules (including the "challenge" procedure) discussed above. A moderator should be familiar with them and able to refer to them quickly. Here are some additional rules or suggestions, which can in the moderator's discretion be shared with the voters at the head of the meeting or selectively invoked as occasion warrants. (And the moderator may modify any of them, except the four statutory rules identified in Chapter IV, as may seem appropriate.) Some of what follows here and that is in the "Notes for Voters" is derived from the work of Randi Sutphin, cited in Chapter IX of this Manual. In a few instances the following may repeat but elaborate on a rule in the "Notes for Voters."

Moderator controls. As discussed above, no one may speak without first being recognized by the moderator, and all persons shall be silent at the moderator's command. A person, once recognized by the moderator, has the floor and the right to speak without interruption (except to the extent interrupting motions are allowed by the adopted rules, or when the moderator interrupts, e.g., to call for silence in the seats) until he or she has exhausted the time allotted.

A moderator may wonder whether the moderator should stand or sit while debate and discussion are in progress. There is no fixed rule. The moderator can sit after recognizing each speaker, or simply stand back from the rostrum or lectern while a voter speaks.

Additional Rules. Here are some suggested rules not included in the "Notes to Voters."

1. Voters should not clamor to be recognized. This distracts and may even intimidate some voters.

2. Time limit on debate. Any time limit imposed should be fairly short. General parliamentary procedure manuals often limit a speaker to a total of ten minutes on any one subject or question. But, unlike agendas for monthly or quarterly meetings of boards of

directors of local and other organizations, annual town meeting agendas are large, often comprised of 50 or more articles of business. Accordingly, for annual meeting a limit of as little as three or four minutes total per speaker per question may be appropriate, while for a special meeting with only one or two questions a longer time might be more feasible. Most speakers will exercise self-restraint, so it is possible that, with a little cajoling of others, no formal limit will have to be fixed. If one is, it will be wise to appoint a volunteer (not the clerk, who has enough to do) as a timekeeper.

3. If a time limit per speaker is established, then unused time is not transferable.

4. Where there are speakers both pro and con (a moderator can always ask before allowing debate to begin), **the debate should alternate between speakers for and against.** If this is not done, and a motion is approved to curtail debate, the voters will have heard only one side.

5. Extended debate on procedural motions is discouraged. Save time for substance.

6. Town meeting is not a courtroom: cross-examination will not be allowed. Even an inquirer who observes proper procedure by putting questions to the moderator for referral to another will not be allowed to engage indirectly in an extended interview of another.

7. No one may hinder the moderator's view of a speaker.

8. Unless the hall is on fire, a voter should not interrupt a speaker. For example, one wishing to move The Previous Question should wait until a speaker has concluded.

9. "I call the question," "I move the previous question" and "Question!" A voter who has

already spoken twice on the subject, or who has already exhausted or nearly exhausted any fixed time allotted for speaking, should not be the one who seeks to terminate debate, certainly not while anyone wishing to speak has not been heard a first time. Rule the motion out of order when made by such a voter, or, more informally, ask whether someone who has not spoken wishes to adopt the motion and be substituted as the movant.

IX. CONCLUSION AND SOURCES

The material in this Manual answers perhaps 95% of parliamentary questions relating to town meeting. For aid with others, a moderator may want to have one or more of the following compilations: the pertinent chapters from MMA's *Town Meeting and Elections Manual*; *Town Meeting Time* (for the full title see the Introduction to this Manual), available from Massachusetts Moderators Association, P. O. Box 1795, Boston, MA 02105 -1795; and Randi Sutphin, *Parliamentary Procedure Basics for Governmental Bodies*, 3rd ed., Agenda Associates, Orlando, FL (1998). Other compilations can be found in bookstores and on-line.

Online sources for further learning include: www.csufresno.edu/comm/cagle-p3.htm; www.robertsrules.com; www.parliamentaryprocedure.org; and www.parliamentarians.org.

Professor Cagle's webpages are particularly useful.

Suggestions for improvement to this Manual are welcome. Send them to: Ellerbe Cole, Esq., Legal Services Department, Maine Municipal Association, 60 Community Drive, Augusta, ME 04330.

APPENDIX

30-A M.R.S.A. § 2524. General Town Meeting Provisions

The following provisions apply to all town meetings:

1. Qualified voter. Every voter in the town may vote in the election of all town officials and in all town affairs.
2. Moderator elected and sworn. The clerk, or in the clerk's absence a selectman or constable, shall open the meeting by:
 - A. Calling for the election of a moderator by written ballot;
 - B. Receiving and counting the votes for moderator; and
 - C. Swearing in the moderator.
3. Moderator presides. As soon as he has been elected and sworn, the moderator shall preside over and supervise the voting at the meeting and may appoint a deputy moderator to assist the moderator. If the moderator is absent or is unable to carry out the duties, the clerk, or in the clerk's absence a selectman or constable, may call for the election of a deputy moderator to act in the absence of the moderator.
 - A. All persons shall be silent at the moderator's command. A person may not speak before that person is recognized by the moderator. A person who is not a voter in the town may speak at the meeting only with the consent of 2/3 of the voters present.
 - (1) If any person, after a command for order by the moderator, continues to act in a disorderly manner, the moderator may direct that person to leave the meeting. If the person refuses to leave, the moderator may have that person removed by a constable and confined until the meeting is adjourned.
 - B. When a vote declared by the moderator is immediately questioned by at least 7 voters, the moderator shall make it certain by polling the voters or by a method directed by the municipal legislative body.
 - C. The moderator shall serve until the meeting is adjourned. The moderator is subject to the same penalties for neglect of official duty as other town officials.
4. Votes recorded by clerk. The clerk shall accurately record the votes of the meeting.
 - A. If the clerk is absent, the moderator shall appoint and swear in a temporary clerk.
5. Written ballots. The clerk shall prepare the ballots. Ballots shall be of uniform size and color, and must be blank except that 2 squares with "yes" by one and "no" by the other may be printed on them.

The moderator shall ensure that each voter receives only one ballot for each vote taken.
6. Location of meetings. Town meetings may be held outside the corporate limits of the municipality if the municipal officers determine that there is no adequate facility for the meeting within the municipality. The proposed location must be:
 - A. Within an adjoining or nearby municipality;
 - B. Not more than 25 miles from the corporate limits of the municipality holding the meetings; and
 - C. Reasonably accessible to all voters of the town.

NOTES FOR VOTERS ON TOWN MEETING PROCEDURE

Rules of procedure, in general. It is important to understand two core concepts. First, rules of procedure are not rules of law. Their purpose is to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, and courts will usually uphold a moderator's decision and the actions of a meeting unless clear unfairness or error resulting in misunderstanding or confusion has actually affected the vote. Second, questions about appropriate procedure or the outcome of a vote should be addressed in the meeting itself (see the discussion of "appeal" and "challenge," below). If questionable decisions or determinations of the vote are not brought to the moderator's attention and addressed on the spot, a court may decline to review the issue later, even where it would otherwise be appropriate for judicial review.

Distinguishing or Separating Voters and Non-Voters. Please respect any measures in effect for distinguishing or separating voters from non-voters.

Unanimous Consent. To expedite procedure, the moderator may from time to time invite or suggest that the meeting give "unanimous consent" to proceeding in a certain way. Cooperation where you can freely give it will usually save time and avoid unnecessary complication, but if you do not wish to give consent simply call out "Objection" or "I object" when the moderator asks for unanimous consent. The moderator may then suggest or invite a motion and vote on procedure and you will then have the opportunity to speak in opposition to the procedure.

Rules of Debate. Maine law makes three rules: (1) a person may not speak without being recognized by the moderator; (2) everyone shall be silent at the moderator's command; and (3) a person who is not a town voter may not speak without the consent of two-thirds of the voters present. In addition, the moderator may ask that one or more of the following rules be observed, and may invoke others to maintain good order and decorum. Raise your hand or stand, as directed by the moderator, to be recognized, and then state your name and what you would like to do. Stand while speaking unless otherwise directed or authorized by the moderator. Refrain from making negative motions ("I move that Article 16 be defeated"). After a motion has been made and seconded, the moderator will open the floor for discussion. The moderator may call on the Selectmen or other sponsors of an article to speak first on a main motion (a motion to approve an article as printed, for example). Thereafter, the affirmative side speaks. A person who makes a motion is entitled but not required to be the first speaker on the motion and may not vote against the motion but may seek consent to withdraw it. A person seconding a motion may both speak against it and vote against it. Do not make a speech and conclude it with a motion: rather, make the motion and then speak to it after it has been seconded and put to floor debate by the moderator. Address all remarks and all questions to the moderator alone. Remarks must be relevant to the motion. Debate will generally alternate between those in favor and those opposed. No one should address the same subject more than twice without the express permission of the moderator. The meeting may establish a time limit per speaker per question and an overall time limit on a motion. No one may speak a second time until all who wish to speak a first time have done so. Speak to the issue, not to the person, and do not question motives or speak ill of another. Profanity is out of order. Do not read from any document except the warrant without first obtaining the moderator's consent. Listen attentively, do not whisper in the seats, and do not interrupt a speaker. Take conversation outside, and mute all but emergency workers' cell phones.

Nominations and Elections. No second is required for a nomination, but the moderator may request or require a candidate's consent to run (and if elected to serve), as a safeguard not only against the possibility that a nominee who is present will decide not to accept an office once won, but also as a safeguard against election of an absent person who when notified declines the office.

Written Ballot. State law requires the moderator, selectmen, and school committee members to be elected by written ballot, even if there is only one nominee. On motion and a majority of votes cast, or by unanimous consent, the meeting can determine to require written ballot voting on other offices or on any business or other article on the warrant. Do not fold, and do not allow another to fold, your ballot with another, or they may both be invalidated.

Appeal. A voter who thinks it appropriate to follow a procedure other than one announced by the moderator may seek to be recognized and then move a procedure the voter believes more appropriate.

Methods of Voting. These are, in increasing order of certainty (and, for most, of the time required): voice vote, show of hands, rising (or standing) vote, division of the house, and written ballot vote.

Challenge. A voter who thinks the moderator has not correctly determined the outcome of a voice or other vote short of an actual count and who wishes to challenge the moderator's determination should immediately seek to be recognized, and when recognized, say "I doubt it." The moderator will then determine whether at least six other voters agree. If so, the moderator will make the determination more certain by using a designated other method of voting.